

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 8, 2009. Claims 55, 58-60, 63-65, and 68-69 are presented for examination, of which Claims 55, 60, and 65 are in independent form. Claims 55, 60, and 65 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 55, 58-60, 63-65, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,681,392 (*Henry*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,864 (*Danknick et al.*), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135 (*Webb et al.*). For at least the following reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 55, 60, and 65, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 55 is directed to an information processing apparatus in communication with a plurality of client apparatuses via a network. The apparatus includes a programmed processor that controls communications with the plurality of client apparatuses. The programmed processor includes determining means, designation means, and transmission controlling means. The determining means determines one or more of the plurality of client apparatuses on which the driver is to be set up. Before the driver is set up, the designation means designates, on a graphical user interface of an installer of the driver, whether test printing is to be executed after the driver set-up has been completed. If the designation means designates that the test printing is to be executed, the transmission controlling means controls operations to transmit to each of the one or more of the plurality of client apparatuses determined by the determining means via the network, without waiting for a request from any of the plurality of client apparatuses, a set-up instruction to set up the driver

and a test printing instruction to execute test printing to check if the driver set-up has been completed. If the designation means designates that the test printing is not to be executed, the transmission controlling means controls operations to transmit the set-up instruction, but not the test printing instruction, to each of the one or more of the plurality of client apparatuses determined by the determining means, without waiting for a request from any of the plurality of client apparatuses.

Notable features of Claim 55 include the designation means and the transmission controlling means. By virtue of the operation of these features, the apparatus according to Claim 55 is able to quickly install drivers and perform test printing on multiple client apparatuses, for example.¹

Henry et al. is understood to relate to remote installation of software, such as drivers and control programs, on networked computers and workstations (*see* col. 1, lines 7-16). Applicant agrees with the Office Action's conclusion that *Henry et al.* fails to disclose designation means that designates whether a test printing instruction is to be executed after a driver set-up has completed (*see* Office Action, pages 2 and 3).

Danknick et al. relates to a network device that interfaces to a peripheral device on a network, receives peripheral status data from the peripheral device, and outputs a test page that contains network information, such as printer information (*see* col. 1, lines 9-14). *Danknick et al.* discusses that, by manipulating function buttons on a front panel of a printer on which a network expansion device has been installed, test pages can be printed out by the printer (*see* col. 2, lines 55-58). Nothing in *Danknick et al.* is understood to teach or suggest that the front panel of the printer can be used to designate, before a driver is set up, whether a test printing

¹ Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

instruction is to be transmitted to each of a plurality of client apparatuses on which the driver is to be set up.

Webb et al. is understood to relate to a method of providing status information for multiple printers at a site of one or more host computers in bidirectional communication with the printers (*see col. 1, lines 9-13*). *Webb et al.* discusses that clicking on a Diagnostics button can cause a Printer I/O Diagnostics screen to be presented (*see col. 2, lines 19-21*). *Webb et al.* also discusses that clicking on a Test Page button appearing on a Printer I/O Configuration screen permits a test page to be printed in any of a number of printer languages (*see col. 2, lines 21-26*). Nothing in *Webb et al.* is understood to teach or suggest that the Test Page button can be used to designate, before a driver is set up, whether a test printing instruction is to be transmitted to each of a plurality of client apparatuses on which the driver is to be set up.

In summary, Applicant submits that a combination of *Henry et al.*, *Danknick et al.*, and *Webb et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest an apparatus that includes “designation means for designating, before the driver is set up, on a graphical user interface of an installer of the driver, whether test printing is to be executed after the driver set-up has been completed” and “transmission controlling means for, if the designation means designates that the test printing is to be executed, controlling operations to transmit, without waiting for a request from any of the plurality of client apparatuses, to each of the one or more of the plurality of client apparatuses determined by the determining means, a set-up instruction to set up the driver and a test printing instruction to execute test printing to check if the driver set-up has been completed, via the network, wherein, if the designation means designates that the test printing is not to be executed, the transmission controlling means controls operations to transmit the set-up instruction, but not the test printing instruction, to each of the

one or more of the plurality of client apparatuses determined by the determining means, without waiting for a request from any of the plurality of client apparatuses,” as recited in Claim 55.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 55 is patentable over the cited references and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 60 and 65 include features sufficiently similar to those of Claim 55 that these claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of independent Claims 55, 60, and 65 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants’ undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/

Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4198056_1